

how slippery a politician can be with retirement money.

The President's budget proposal for Social Security contains more phoney numbers than a Millie Vanilli soundtrack. \$2.4 trillion in double counting. That is even more double counting than the administration's unconstitutional census sampling scheme. And it gets worse from there, Mr. Speaker.

GAO and CBO are both on record stating that the President's proposal for Social Security might actually make the problem worse. The problem, of course, is that the baby-boomers will soon retire and Social Security will greet that event by going belly up faster than can you say Jeff Gordon.

Seniors deserve better. Instead of reassuring seniors that Social Security will be put on a sounder financial footing, the President's proposal sends a message that the politicians will have to deal with the mess after he is gone. The President's Social Security proposal gets an F.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 820, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 113 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 113

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 820) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member of-

fering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), my friend and colleague, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I notice an outbreak of the wearing of the green around the Hill today, and I want to especially extend a happy congratulations for St. Patrick's Day to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), who has a very strong interest in this subject I am advised.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate on this subject only.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present another noncontroversial wide open rule from the Committee on Rules under the benevolent leadership of the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule makes in order an amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for purposes of amendment. It authorizes the chair to accord priority of recognition to those Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is an option available to all Members.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. It is a good rule and it should not engender any opposition. The subject matter is important.

Mr. Speaker, while the Coast Guard is the smallest of our armed services, its responsibilities are great and vitally important. It is an agency with

many missions. We ask the Coast Guard to be responsible for such critical areas as the navigation and safety of our waterways and emergency search and rescue.

As a branch of the Armed Forces, the Coast Guard has also helped defend America in every war since 1790. It has a brave and long tradition. To maintain an effective and ready force, H.R. 820, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1998, authorizes 44,000 active duty military personnel by the end of fiscal year 2001.

Most important to today's debate is the evolving role the Coast Guard is playing on the war on drugs. Last year this Congress reached an agreement with the White House to win the war on drugs, not just trim it back a little and settle for a stalemate. We want to win it. We intend to win this war that is so critical to the future of our youngsters, and this particular legislation helps us on that path.

As so often in this city, we have discovered that talk is cheap. The Clinton White House has submitted a budget that is negligent on the war on drugs and abandons the commitment made by the Clinton White House just last fall to help win that war on drugs. In fact, the Clinton budget request does not implement anything within the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act beyond that contained in last year's omnibus bill.

H.R. 820 puts our money where our mouth is. It fully funds the Western Hemisphere effort, with an additional \$290 million in operating expenses for the next 2 years. This money will have a direct impact at the source of the drug scourge, including additional coastal patrol boats, the creation of a regional law enforcement center in Puerto Rico, several maritime patrol aircraft, several cutters and vessels to be received from the United States Navy. Americans have a right to demand results, not more talk, but results on the war on drugs and H.R. 820 delivers.

A recent study by the Institute for Defense Analysis examining effectiveness of cocaine interdiction found strong links between supply disruptions and rising street prices in the United States. It also found that, when street prices rise, use falls, especially among casual users. We know that interdiction works and that taking dead aim at the supply side must be a large piece of our effort. That does not diminish from the efforts, of course, on the demand side that we also must make. H.R. 820 makes good on our commitment on the supply side.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule that allows open debate and consideration of all germane amendments. I urge a yes vote on the rule as well as the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), my dear friend, who I hope stays with me in the House for a few more years, for yielding me the customary half-hour.

Mr. Speaker, today is March 17. It is not only a great day for the Irish, but it is a great day for the Coast Guard. Mr. Speaker, during the last 84 years, the United States Coast Guard has been protecting people at sea and enforcing United States law.

This bill for which the rule provides consideration will authorize funding for the Coast Guard for another 2 years, including \$380 million for drug interdiction efforts in keeping with last year's Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act. It will also provide funding to finish the design work and the replacement for the Great Lakes icebreaker *Mackinaw*.

This bill will authorize 40,000 active duty Coast Guard personnel who perform all kinds of services, including safety inspections of freighters, transporting sick or injured people to medical attention, measuring the catch of a commercial fishing boat, searching for sailors lost at sea, breaking ice in the northeastern rivers, and on and on.

The first Coast Guard district in my hometown of Boston oversees 30 cutters, 11 aircraft, and more than 200 small boats to ensure boaters' safety. Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues, these people earn their keep. Every day the Coast Guard saves an average of 12 lives. Each year they save about \$2.5 billion in property, which is nearly the entire operating budget.

Earlier this month, a Coast Guard cutter saved an 85-foot tug off the coast of Sakonnet Point in Rhode Island that was taking on water and absolutely would have sunk if the Coast Guard did not come on the scene.

Last month, Coast Guard personnel responded to a 200-gallon gasoline spill in New Haven Harbor; and before allowing the boat to load any new cargo, the Coast Guard ensured that that boat had been properly repaired before it went underway.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year a Coast Guard helicopter rescued from a New Bedford fishing vessel a fisherman whose arm was hanging off because it was injured in a severe accident by a winch and they flew this injured seaman to a Rhode Island hospital, where he recovered.

In January, the United States Coast Guard crew saved six people on a 72-foot sailing vessel in trouble seven miles south of Gloucester, Massachusetts. And every day the Coast Guard is out there protecting people on American waters. They do us a wonderful service, and this bill would keep them up and running.

I would like to commend the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for putting together a truly bipartisan bill which should pass the House with very little opposition.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will enable the Coast Guard to continue its great work, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I join my colleague from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in heaping praise on the Coast Guard for extraordinary work under extremely difficult conditions. Anybody who has been in New England in the winter knows just what he speaks of when he talks about being out there on the high seas.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

This is a great day for the Irish, a great day for the Coast Guard, a great day for the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), and maybe a great day for America's steel industry and steelworkers. I support the rule on the Coast Guard. But I also plan to speak out of turn on the rule that will follow since it is limited for time.

Ronald Reagan came to my district in 1980. He stood on a flatbed truck. Struggling steelworkers were pleading with the President for help. Ronald Reagan made a pledge. He said, "I will support the steel industry. I will make significant investments to help retool the steel industry." And he said, "I will also make significant investments to retrain steelworkers so they can deal with the new steel technologies."

Those steelworkers did not even support Ronald Reagan. Ronald Reagan lived up to every word. From the investment tax credit, to retraining money, Ronald Reagan lived up to his word.

In 1992, a candidate named Bill Clinton came through my district all through the steel Rust Belt and went down through Wierton, West Virginia. He said, "I will ban illegal trade to protect the steel industry." And he even said, "I will stop and I will ban scab labor."

In 1993, President Clinton had a Democrat House and a Democrat Senate. There was not one word about scab labor, regardless about how we feel on the issue. And in 1999, Bill Clinton has not done one thing about illegal trade.

Labor unions and working people supported this President by more than 95 percent. Today's legislation is not perfect. Not all of us are totally enamored with all parts of it. But until this

moment, the President is saying he may not support it. I say, on the House floor, labor unions have been the suckers. How many more cock-and-bull stories are they going to hear?

Now, the only statement I will make is I want to support this bill. I support this rule even though it is a closed rule. And it is time for Congress to take one other stand. See, I do not believe we should be debating illegal trade. I do not believe we should be legislating illegal trade. I think illegal trade should be banned and we should have taken this opportunity to send a message to the world.

The only thing that bothers me about the bills since I have been in Congress is I keep hearing Members say, "it is the best we can do."

□ 1045

What I say is if the best we can do is not the best for America, then it is not the best we can do and we should not do it.

I am going to support this bill. I believe if this President vetoes this bill, his veto should be overridden, and if he vetoes this bill, I think the American worker better take a good look at a lot of promises that have been made over the years by this administration that have not been lived up to.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Lest Members might be a little confused, the gentleman who just spoke so passionately and eloquently about the steel matter and talking about a closed rule was not talking about the rule that we have on the floor now. This is a wide open rule, and I urge its strong support by all Members.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 975, REDUCING VOLUME OF STEEL IMPORTS AND ESTABLISHING STEEL IMPORT NOTIFICATION AND MONITORING PROGRAM

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 114 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 114

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 975) to provide for a reduction in the volume of steel imports, and to establish a steel import notification and